

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/921,005	HAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jerry A. Lorengo	1734	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorengo. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Charles Wendel. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 December 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

J.A. LORENGO

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Upon receipt of the response to the first office action mailed June 11, 2003, the examiner determined that the pending claims as amended, excluding claims 29-34, would be allowable. The examiner, however, contacted Mr. Wendel in order to inform him that claims 29-34 would remain rejected. The examiner also suggested that, in order to pass the case to issue, either claims 29-34 could be cancelled or claim 29 could be amended to include the allowable subject matter set forth in claim 1. Mr. Wendel agreed and gave his authorization to amend claim 29 to include the allowable subject matter of applicant claim 1. This amendment is set forth in section (2) of the attached office action/notice of allowance. .